4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

of light material or else of coarse wool, in which case it could be worn over the shirt, and it was usually buckled or pinned at the shoulder or in front of the neck. In cold weather sheepskins or the cheaper pelts (bear, wolf) were worn for warmth. Women of the people were clad in a long shirt of rough linen or hempen fabric, often representing a mere cylinder held up by straps over the shoulders. From the waist down they also wore a double apron attached to a belt, while the upper part of the body might be encased in a coarse woolen jacket, along with a cloak of similar material around the neck and shoulders. Footwear consisted of rough leather slippers held by a thong over the ankle or of slippers made of bast fiber. Men frequently wore wrapped leggings. Married women might wear a kerchief or bonnet on their heads over hair cut short, but maidens habitually went bareheaded, wearing their hair long and braided. Men also wore their hair long in the primitive period. Close shearing and shaving, where they occur, are due to foreign influences, and in general it may be said that in matters of attire the Slavs were always prompt to adopt foreign usages.

Originally a peaceful race, the primitive Slavs were unskilled in the use of weapons. When they were first noticed by foreign writers they had no offensive equipment except bows and spears, and were unprotected by even the most elementary shields. It has already been noted that in the Slavic vocabulary the words for helmet and sword were taken over from the Goths. In the succeeding centuries, the constant warfare of the migratory epoch and the necessity of defense against successive nomad incursions produced a marked amplification of Slavic military equipment representing a fusion of borrowed alien techniques so that when the southern Slavs invaded Greece at the end of the sixth century, their soldier was considered to be as good a fighter as the Byzantine regular. The Slavs, however, used no mounted troops until well into the historical period.

The Slavs were drawn very early into the orbit of European commerce, which in the peripheral areas of European antiq-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

steppes to the Danube, they threatened the Greek peninsula, where their first occupation dates from 581.

Contemporary chroniclers report that the Slavs had by that time acquired wealth by pillage and fought even better than the regular Greek troops. On the Adriatic, they occupied the districts of Illyria, Dalmatia, and Istria early in the seventh century. Shortly afterward the Slavs on the western front (the Czechs and those on the Adriatic seaboard) overthrew the Avar hegemony and became independent, but after the Avars were thus weakened, the Slavs never menaced Constantinople again. Yet by the end of the seventh century the whole interior of the Balkan peninsula, especially Macedonia and its neighborhood, was populated by Slavs. They even took to the sea and reached Crete in 623. At the height of the Avar expansion, the Slavs had already passed through Thessaly, Epirus, and Attica, and reached the Peloponnese in 588. Here their occupation was so formidable that, for the next two centuries, a Byzantine Greek scarcely dared set foot in the southern portion of the peninsula, while in the north the Danube was never again fixed as the frontier of the Byzantine Empire after 601. On the other hand, it is not to be supposed that the Slavs were ever in the majority in Greece proper. Subject Greeks still formed the mass of the population. Were this not the case, it would be difficult to explain the eventual and rather rapid subsequent disappearance of the Slavic element south of Macedonia.

Once the Slavs were firmly established in the Balkans, they immediately became exposed to the older cultures they found there. Those on the Adriatic coast and in the western Danube basin felt the impact of Latin civilization transmitted through romanized native populations, through colonial centers, or through the cities of the seaboard. When they settled within the sphere of Greek influence, the dominant cultural pressure was Byzantine. The results of these accidents of location are still discernible in the intellectual orientation of the Balkan Slavs.

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

(first the Cimmerians, then the Scythians and the Sarmatians) succumbed to the Gothic hegemony, which was broken by the Hunnish attack of 370 A.D. The Huns were the precursors of a long series of Turko-Tartar invaders who crossed the steppes in historical times and offered a succession of recurrent barriers to any large-scale and enduring East Slavic migration toward the Black Sea. The Huns were followed in the sixth century by the Avars, who did not remain long in the steppes, but pushed on into the Danube basin where we have already met them as allies and later masters of the Danubian Slavs during the migration period.

While the Avars were sowing destruction along the northern border of the Byzantine empire, a new Turkic power was rising between the Don and the Volga. The immense Turkic agglomeration, which extended in the late sixth century from Mongolia to the Sea of Azov, had divided into two parts, eastern and western. The center of the western section was located on the lower Volga, and its prince or khan was inferior in standing only to the Great Khan of the eastern Turks. To the inhabitants of this western Turkic state, the name Khazars was given by the Armenians, from whom the Byzantines borrowed it.

During the Avar disturbances along the Danube and in the Balkans at the end of the sixth century, the remnants of the Hunnish and Bulgar tribes (both Turko-Tartar) east of the Don had restored some semblance of union and developed for a brief period into an ambitious state. The power of the Avars was concentrated far to the west and exercised only an inefficient control over their eastern marches. One active Bulgarian princeling named Kubrat applied for Byzantine aid in casting off the Avar yoke and apparently received this support at the price of his conversion to Christianity. At his death in 642, Kubrat had come to rule over a broad territory known as Great Old Bulgaria, which extended from the lower Don down to the Kuban district in the northern Caucasus. After the demise of Kubrat, his realm fell a prey to the energetic Turks who were

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

destined to develop the Khazar state. The advance of the Khazars inspired a wide dispersion of the Bulgars. One branch recrossed the Don and, continuing northward, eventually settled near the junction of the Volga and the Kama, where they appear in later Russian history. The other section moved westward and, after uniting with their tribal kinsmen who had preceded them into the Balkans, carried their standards to Salonika in 675 before they settled in Moesia and fused with the South Slavs already resident there. But the Khazars remained in the steppe country, and gradually spread out across the prairies until they reached the southern Bug.

From such indications as we have that the Eastern Slavs had penetrated as far east as the Sea of Azov in the sixth century, their contacts with the various waves of mobile Asiatic invaders must have been closer than the scanty data of extant sources record though, in view of the infinitely small number of Turko-Tartar loan words which found their way into the Slavic vocabulary prior to the recorded history of the Slavs, it is evident that this contact was productive of little intellectual influence on the Slavs themselves. In fact, thanks to their association with Iranian and Goth, the Eastern Slavs had attained a degree of civilization at least equal and probably superior to that of the series of Turko-Tartar nomads who traversed southern Russia between the fourth and the seventh centuries.

During this interval, in any case, the steppes between the Don and the Dnieper were the scene of constant shifts of population. Fleeing before the Huns, the Goths had moved back into central Europe. Driven by the Avars, the western Bulgars had pushed forward into the Balkans. The Avars themselves were ultimately demolished by combined Frank, Slav, and Bulgar offensives along the Danube, and the eastern Bulgar units were displaced by the Khazars. The period of Khazar expansion westward was thus an epoch peculiarly favorable for the progress of the Eastern Slavs down the valleys of the Dnieper and the Dniester. Traces of this colonization are preserved in the *Primary Chronicle,* which places the Slavic Uli-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

the expansion of the Eastern Slavs was an accomplished fact, shows them in contact with the Finns on a long line from the Baltic to the upper Don. The chronicler distinguishes three groups of Finns: those on the Baltic, those beyond the upper Volga, and those on the middle Volga itself. The Finnish tribes south of Moscow and between Moscow and the Volga have disappeared, though the other groups are still abundantly represented even today.

Whenever the Eastern Slavs encountered the Finns, the latter either retired or remained passive. Though the Finns may have been bellicose in Tacitus's day, Jordanes knew them only as *mitissimi*—extremely pacific. In these early days the Finns showed no tendency toward urban concentration or to union for defense, while the Slavs, during the period in which their greatest expansion at Finnish expense took place (the ninth and tenth centuries), were already profiting by the military technique and leadership of courageous and enterprising Viking immigrants from Scandinavia.

At this date but one people of Finnish stock undertook an energetic offensive with perceptible historical results. These were the Magyars, who had already been in contact with Turko-Tartar tribes and had thus acquired some warlike talents. The Magyars are related to certain still extant Finnish tribes (the Voguls and the Ostyaks) on the river Ob in Siberia. After splitting off from the ethnic nucleus in about the seventh century, they moved west into southern Russia, where they met the Khazars on the Don. Then, around 860, they pushed on into Moldavia, and finally, after various raids into Pannonia and the Balkans, settled down in the Hungarian plain, where their descendants have lived since about the year 900. Their subsequent contacts were thus largely with the Southern and the Western Slavs.

None of these Finnish tribes have any ethnic or linguistic relationship with the Slavic tribes. But with the Lithuanians the situation is somewhat different. The Lithuanians are an Indo-European people, and their language shows affinity with

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

167 177 vast forests south of the Pripet River, and were, on account of their remote location, culturally backward.

In this respect, they contrast with their eastern neighbors, the Polyane, who lived in the prairie country (their name characterizes them as plain dwellers) on the west bank of the Dnieper north and south of the ancient city of Kiev, which had been a point of settlement since far back into the stone age. It is not unlikely that the metropolis mentioned by the geographer Ptolemy in the second century and the *Danparstathir* of Gothic tradition and the Norse *Hervdrarsdga* were settlements on the site of modern Kiev. Situated on a strategic trade route, the Polyane were exposed to the stimulating influences of both Scandinavian and Byzantine culture as the power of the Khazars waned. It is thus by no means accidental that their chief center became the nucleus toward which adjacent tribes gravitated and that center from which foreign culture radiated throughout the entire period before it was sacked by the Tartars in 1240.

The Ulichians and the Tivercians, the ancestors of the present inhabitants of Subcarpathian Russia, present a more complicated problem. According to the *Primary Chronicle,* they lived on the southern Bug and the Dniester, extending down to the Black Sea coast and as far as the Danube. They [721] are without question the Eastern Slavic tribes which progressed the farthest toward the sea but, because of that same fact, they also occupied a position critically exposed to repeated nomad attacks. They can therefore hardly have moved south until after the departure of the Avars in the sixth century, and they were seriously menaced again by the incursion of the Magyars in the ninth century. We know from Arabic sources that the Magyars even enslaved much of the Slavic population in this area. Then, in the early tenth century, nomad incursions so increased in intensity and frequency that peaceful habitation in the coastal area eventually became impossible. The Ulichians and the Tivercians thus withdrew to the Carpathians and provided an important center of Slavic settlement in Tran-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

early colonizers in territory originally Finnish. The same observation applies to the Slovenes or Novgorod Slavs about Lake Ilmen, who thus approach the region of the great lakes. Just why they alone preserved the ethnic name of the Slavs remains an enigma. At any rate, they were, with the Polyane of Kiev, the most progressive of the Eastern Slavs. Located in an area ill-fitted for agriculture, they lived by hunting and trapping, by which they acquired material for barter with Scandinavian traders. Their pioneering spirit gradually carried them still further north toward Lakes Ladoga and Onega, and since only a short portage separated them from the upper Volga, we eventually find them pushing southeastward to insure a food supply from the grain fields of the Moscow district. They founded the city of Novgorod where the Volkhov flows out of Lake Ilmen, and economic and political collisions between this city and Moscow were a familiar feature of later medieval Russian history until the Muscovites emerged as victors.

Just south of the Slovenes lived the Krivichians, who dominated the headwaters of the Dvina, Dnieper, and Volga rivers and extended northwest until they collided with the Balts and Finns in the neighborhood of modern Pskov. Their chief centers, both of which owed their importance to river traffic, were Polotzk on the Dvina and Smolensk on the upper Dnieper. Since Smolensk is situated at an easy portage point between the Dvina, Lovat, and Dnieper rivers, it was one of the earliest points of Scandinavian settlement in the interior of Russia.

It stands to reason that, at the dawn of Russian history, these tribes must have in many instances progressed far beyond any patriarchal organization on the basis of kinship. Essentially an agricultural people, yet living also by hunting and trapping in newly colonized and sparsely settled areas, the Russian Slavs tended to develop beyond a purely patriarchal society as soon as they came to inhabit small farms grouped about a fortified village which served as a focal point for defense and as a rudimentary market for the exchange of their products. Such of these villages as were located on the chief watercourses developed

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

in the service. Hence, though much of early south or east Slavic literature is either translated or imitated, the fact remains that the Slavs under Byzantine intellectual and religious influence developed significant national cultures much more rapidly than those under the domination of Rome. That these cultures, after a brilliant initial spurt, were later retarded and even brought to a halt which lasted several centuries is due, not to the source of conversion itself, but to historical accidents which supervened after conversion took place. Had not the Eastern and the Southern Slavs fallen victims, in one case to Tartar invasion and in the other to Turkish conquest, their intellectual lag in comparison with the rest of Europe would not have been so great. The Russians, for example, were completely deprived of all Western stimulation after the middle of the thirteenth century and nearly three hundred years elapsed before they entered upon the difficult process of assimilating the Western culture which had developed during that long and critical interval. The South Slavs, on the other hand, shook off the Turkish yoke only within the last century and thus were even more handicapped than the Russians in their struggle to catch up with the modern world.

Of all the Slavs, the Slovenes in Carinthia and Carniola were the first to encounter missionary activities. Early in the seventh century, they had been temporarily combined with Czechs and Sorbs north of the Danube in the semilegendary kingdom under Samo, who led them victoriously against the Avars and simultaneously offered a temporary barrier to Frankish expansion southward. During his declining years in Switzerland, Saint Columban, the great Irish missionary, had thought, as early as 612, of setting out from Bregenz on a mission to the nearest Slavs, but, finding the task too difficult for his advanced age (he was already sixty-nine), he retired to Italy and ended his days at Bobbio.

After Samo disappeared from the scene and his realm was dissolved, the Slovenes were unable to withstand the Avars, who soon held the Danube as far as the Enns. The Slovenes

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

then applied for aid to the Bavarians. The latter beat off the Avars, but in 750 also seized control of Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola. Then, in 788, when Charlemagne deposed Duke Tassilo of Bavaria, all Bavarian dependencies fell under the sway of the Carolingian realm. Even before this date, some of the local Slovene nobility had been converted to Christianity and consequently intermarried with Bavarian families. A number of churches had thus been founded in this area by missionaries from Salzburg, and a considerable proportion of the local Slovene population had also been Christianized before the epoch of Carolingian sovereignty.

When this sovereignty became established, missionary activities were intensified. During the reign of Charlemagne there were two centers from which missionary activity reached the Slovenes: the archbishopric of Salzburg and the patriarchate of Aquileia, at the head of the Adriatic. The former soon took the lead, and after Charlemagne defeated and dispersed the Avars in 796, the area between the Danube and the Theiss which they evacuated was added to the diocese of Salzburg. Bavarian missionaries accompanied German colonists into this district, where the new Slavic occupants were rapidly converted and Germanized, especially as the Slavic landlords were rapidly eliminated. The first bishop regularly assigned to the Slovenes was Deodoricus, ordained at Salzburg in 799. His diocese extended to the river Drave, which was the dividing line between the sees of Salzburg and Aquileia.

Similar missionary activity was also set in motion among the neighboring Croats south and east of the Slovenes. As the power of the Byzantine empire declined, the Frankish power gradually extended to the Slavs of the Adriatic coastline, so that the Dalmatian Croats were subject to the Franks from 803, and Frankish authority was but little impaired by the revolt of the Croat prince Lyudevit against Louis the Pious from 819 to 822. A few years later, for political reasons, an inland Croat district headed by Margrave Pribina, a Frankish feudatory with his headquarters in Pannonia near Lake Bala-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

ton, experienced a period of intense missionary activity stimulated by its chief. Pribina thus entered into the good graces of King Louis the German, and in 850 the archbishop of Salzburg consecrated the first Christian church in Pribina's dominions at Mosaburg, on Lake Balaton. Since fully half the notables present on this occasion bore German names, it is clear how intense German immigration had been and how far the policy of Germanization pursued by the Bavarian missionaries had proceeded. Within fifteen years Pribina's territory contained more than thirty-two churches and many monasteries. On the other hand, conversion and colonization also contributed to diminishing the area occupied by pure Slavic populations, and the rapid contraction of Slovene and Croat territory southward from the Danube is due primarily to this process.

After the dissolution of Samo's kingdom about 650, the Western Slavs in modern Czechoslovak territory played no role in history until Charlemagne's campaigns against the Avars one hundred forty years later. On these campaigns the emperor's troops passed through Bohemia, and since the pagan Slavs of this area threatened the flank of the empire, they were subjected to Frankish attacks after the year 800. Louis the Pious already possessed numerous Bohemian vassals, and in 845 fourteen Czech chieftains appeared in Regensburg at the court of Louis the German to request baptism. Somewhat further eastward, the kindred Moravians were united under one prince, Mojmir, who, though still a pagan, was also a vassal of Louis the German and thus did not oppose the operations of missionaries from Regensburg and Passau.

When Mojmir died in 845, Louis chose as the prince's successor the latter's nephew Rostislav, whom he regarded as stupid and who, he hoped, would be grateful for this elevation. Rostislav proved to be neither. Not only did he pursue Mojmir's consolidation tactics, but, while letting his allies, the disunited Czech tribes, fight against the Franks, he still maintained outward loyalty to Louis and actively promoted a policy

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

of Christianization, hoping that a common faith would eventually combine all neighboring Slavic tribes under his sway. This ingenious policy soon worried Louis to the point where he sent a Bavarian force against Rostislav in 855, at the same time detailing another detachment to prevent the Czechs from helping him. This punitive expedition was a failure. Rostislav chased the Bavarians out of his territory and became virtually independent. The next few years were too full of complications in the west to allow Louis the luxury of reprisals against Rostislav, who extended his sway along the Danube at the expense of the disorganized Avars, and finally, in 860, deposed the Croat Prince Pribina in favor of the latter's son Kotzel. Since Pribina was loyal to Louis the German, this exploit was carried out under the pretext of making common cause with Louis' rebellious son Carloman, margrave of the Ostmark, who hoped to gain the empire with Slavic support.

In any case, Rostislav was at this juncture the independent chief of a large group of Slavic tribes, not only in Moravia but also south of the Danube. He could not be certain that Carloman, if successful, would deal any more gently with him than did Louis the German. Rostislav's expansion along the Danube had brought him into direct touch with the Bulgarians who, under the Khagan Krum before 814 and his successor Omurtag thereafter, had become a pagan state important enough to maintain diplomatic relations with both Franks and Byzantines. The Bulgarians supported Louis the German against Carloman, and Boris, their prince since 852, was now toying with the possibility of accepting conversion from Byzantium. Rostislav himself had succeeded reasonably well with the political emancipation of his countrymen. What more natural than that he should also seek their religious autonomy by creating a clergy who could use the vernacular, and would perhaps wield the book more efficiently than the sword? For the priests and monks from Salzburg and Passau were at least as good soldiers as they were clerics—the church militant in person.

Rostislav thus seems to have thought of Slavic-speaking mis-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

earlier, and is reflected in the increased importance of the more remote northeastern domains of Rostov, Suzdal, and Murom, between the Oka and the Volga where the nomad menace did not reach.

While the inarticulate masses bore the brunt of the crisis, the wealth of the ruling class was for the moment not impaired, but rather enhanced. As long as the princes and their retainers were prosperous, the wealth of the Church also increased by grants and gifts. Monasteries multiplied and new churches were erected. Contact with Byzantium was still preserved. Through the expansion of the hierarchy under Greek guidance and example, the intellectual progress initiated by Yaroslav was intensified. To be sure, this culture remained aristocratic and ecclesiastical, but in this respect it hardly differed from the contemporary civilization of Western Europe, even though deprived of the continuity of classical tradition which lay at the root of the culture developed under the aegis of Rome. Marital alliances with German, Hungarian, and Polish princely families show at the same time that the Russian princes attached but slight importance to differences between the Eastern and Western Churches even after the schism of 1054.

No sooner had Vladimir Monomach died in 1125 when strife among the princes became rife once more. Competition for the control of Novgorod developed between the prince of Kiev and Monomach's son George whose domain lay at Suzdal in the northeast. Rival princes sacked and plundered one another's domains. One unpopular prince was even lynched by the angry Kievan populace. In 1149, Prince George captured Kiev himself, thus proving the vitality and resources of the northeastern area, but was unable to hold the metropolis permanently before 1155. When George died in 1160, however, the city had been fought over so constantly in the previous thirty years that practically all its dependent territory had been nipped off by neighboring principalities and it had been stripped of every element of its political prestige. Hence the possession of Kiev no longer conferred upon the ruling prince

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

the slightest claim of primacy. Indeed, George's able son Andrew entertained no respect for Kiev at all and concentrated his efforts on enriching and adorning his own northeastern domain, which he ruled so autocratically that he was assassinated in 1174. Andrew's son Vsevolod who possessed equal capacity and better judgment, was recognized as a leader by all adjacent local princes, though he interfered but little in Kievan affairs and on the western Russian frontier the prestige of Vsevolod's domain was balanced by the rise of a powerful Galician principality. Kiev itself was disastrously sacked by the Polovtsi in 1203, and of this event a chronicler wrote, "No such woe had ever befallen Kiev during the whole time since conversion."

Amid the uncertainties of Russian political life at the beginning of the thirteenth century, the shadows of future events were already gathering. The German knights were moving up the Baltic coast, where Riga was founded in 1201. Their intrusion impelled the threatened Lithuanian tribes to unity, with the result that a Lithuanian state arose which began to absorb the northwestern Russian cities, though Russian culture in turn absorbed the conquerors. The Russians were not friendly to the Latin Empire of Byzantium after 1204, and it was in 1206 that the Mongols under Temuchin (better known as Genghis Khan) began their military expansion. But the Russian princes continued their petty quarrels, not suspecting the catastrophe that was impending.

The Mongols or Tartars first reconnoitered the country west of the Caspian in 1220, and the next year they menaced the Crimea and the steppe country, thus forcing the Polovtsi to apply for support to the Russian princes against whom they had so often fought. Since 1212, Kiev had been in the possession of Prince Mstislav, a member of the ruling family of Smolensk, able, courageous, and erratic; his wife was the daughter of a Polovtsian khan. The princes of Kiev, Chernigov, and Volhynia thus united with the Polovtsi against the Tartars, whom they met on the river Kalka, in the steppes near the

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

Sea of Azov, in May 1224. Though the Russians were defeated and Mstislav of Kiev with other princes was slain, the Mongols contented themselves with pursuing the fleeing remnants of the Russian force to the Dnieper and then retired to Asia. Since the casualties at the Kalka entailed several dynastic changes, the domains of Chernigov, Kiev, and Galicia were now drawn into a loose confederation, while Suzdal controlled Novgorod, which opposed the Teutonic order and subjected the Finns of Esthonia and Karelia.

Meanwhile Genghis Khan had died in 1227, and eight years later his son and successor decided to renew the campaign into Europe under the command of Genghis Khan's grandson Batu. In 1237, after subjugating the Volga Bulgars near Kazan, Batu crossed the Volga to capture and sack the city of Ryazan, about one hundred miles southeast of Moscow. During the winter of 1237-38, the Mongols turned northward and burned the city of Vladimir, east of Moscow, after a successful siege. When Prince George II of Suzdal, whose family had perished, attacked the Tartars, he was defeated and killed. The invaders next started for Novgorod, but suspended the campaign because of the spring thaw, and went into summer quarters in the south near the mouth of the Don. Chernigov fell in 1239. The following autumn the Mongols appeared before Kiev and, as the *Chronicle* says,

The Tartars took Kiev, and sacked St. Sophia and all the monasteries. And they took the icons, the holy crosses, and all church ornaments. But all the people, from small to large, they slew by the sword. This woe occurred before Christmas, on St. Nicholas' day.

By the fall of 1241, the Tartars had defeated the Poles at Liegnitz, crushed the Hungarians, and appeared before Vienna. But the fortunes of Europe changed, for Ugedei, the Great Khan, died, and Batu retired east to await the election of his successor. Yet he maintained his hegemony over Russia and

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

from the Tartars if a prince lost or surrendered his previous holdings. Hence the princes came to set more store by personal estates, and since the Tartars in their own interest were unlikely to tolerate any large principalities, the resulting dismemberment of the major units produced a large number of smaller domains, or appanages, which passed on by inheritance, whether or not the holder might become prince of some other area by the tender mercies of the Tartars. At the same time, the Tartar invasions greatly increased the number of landless peasants—dispossessed or impoverished small farmers—who became tenant farmers for large landlords on a quitrent basis.

Under Tartar hegemony the princes of Vladimir maintained at least a nominal control over the neighboring principalities and were the spokesmen of the Russian princes before the Tartar khans. These functions were, at any rate, sufficiently important and lucrative to inspire some rivalry for the possession of the title. In 1367 Prince Dmitri Donskoi erected a stone kremlin, or citadel, at Moscow and endeavored to subject the neighboring princes to his will. He met with some resistance from Prince Michael of Tver, who tried to purchase Tartar approval for himself, but was later forced to become Dmitri's vassal. The conditions of vassalage were such that dependent princes were obliged to supply Dmitri, as their overlord, with military aid, and when Dmitri won his famous victory over the Tartars in 1380 (the first case of successful Russian resistance), they supported him in this way.

The decline of the Tartars, manifested by conflicts of authority in the khanate itself, had begun almost a century before, and even prior to the year 1300 there were moments when the existence of two competing khans placed the Russian princes in a quandary. The struggle for supremacy between the princes of Tver and Moscow (which first became critical shortly before the year 1300) for supremacy as holders of the title Prince of Vladimir was also fought out in this interval. The dominance of Moscow was recognized in 1327 when Prince Ivan I secured authority to farm the Tartar taxes and began to in-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

crease his patrimony toward the north and east. The leadership of Moscow was further enhanced by the fact that the metropolitan of the Russian church moved over from Vladimir and took up his residence there. The rivalry of Tver was diminished and the chief competing power on Russian territory was Lithuania, which controlled most of White Russia and the northwest corner of the Ukraine.

Both the rise of Moscow and the further expansion of Lithuania were encouraged by dissensions which broke out among the Tartars in 1359 and considerably accelerated their decline. Olgerd, the reigning prince of Lithuania, captured Kiev in 1363 and advanced to the Black Sea. He then supported Tver against Moscow and in 1368 was barely prevented from taking the latter city by the new stone battlements which had just been constructed. He was then diverted from his central Russian operations by a war with Poland which cost him western Volhynia; his death in 1377 relieved Moscow for the moment of any Western threat. The Muscovites had no intention of handing back to the Tartars any privileges they had won while the latter were weak, and they were ready to fight for their retention. Such was the motive behind the provocative tactics by which Dmitri Donskoi jockeyed the Tartar Khan Mamai into a punitive expedition which the Russian prince defeated at great cost at Kulikovo Polye (Snipe Field) on the upper Don in 1380. However excessive the loss of life in this operation, the prince of Moscow became through this spectacular exploit the recognized national leader and his city the nucleus of patriotic sentiment. Unfortunately, the effort was so great that two years later the Tartars had no difficulty in entering and sacking the city of Moscow while Dmitri was absent. These events aroused once more the ambitious princes of Tver, whose influence Dmitri was able to cancel only by resuming a loyal feudatory relationship with the Tartars. It is significant nevertheless that Dmitri, on his death in 1389, bequeathed Vladimir to his son Basil I, though Basil was still

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

obliged to secure Tartar ratification of his succession.

Events on the western front had meanwhile not stood still. Upon the death of King Kazimir the Great of Poland in 1370, his throne passed to his nephew, King Louis of Hungary. Louis in turn died in 1382 without male issue, so that the Polish crown devolved upon his thirteen-year-old daughter Yadwiga. Plans were then made to marry her to Prince Yagailo of Lithuania who had succeeded his father Olgerd in 1377. Upon becoming king of Poland in 1386, Yagailo made his cousin Vitovt prince of Lithuania. In this capacity Vitovt maintained friendly relations with the Tartar Khan Tokhtamysh, and he also married his daughter to Prince Basil I of Moscow. But when Tokhtamysh was deposed and fled to Vitovt's court, the latter's refusal to extradite him to his successor resulted in a collision with the Tartars in which Vitovt was soundly beaten. This defeat very largely eliminated the Lithuanian menace, and the consolidation policy of Moscow thus gained greater chances of success. It was momentarily checked in 1408, however, by a Tartar raid to the very gates of the city.

After the famous battle of Grünwald-Tannenberg in 1410, when the Polish-Lithuanian forces defeated the Teutonic knights, Vitovt's stock rose once more to the point where he was practically autonomous as the ruler of a principate which stretched from Memel and Smolensk to the Black Sea. Until his death in 1430 he never abandoned the hope of mastering Moscow, which at this period controlled an area barely one-third as large as his own. But his successor Svidrigailo became involved in a quarrel with Poland which prevented him from exerting any serious pressure on Moscow during the minority of Prince Basil II from 1425 on. Basil was also favored by the fact that many Tartar princes quit the disintegrating khanate and took service with Moscow, while others merely made themselves independent and under the name of Kazaks settled various localities in the Russian steppes. These independent Tartars are, then, the first Cossacks.

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

Basil II was to encounter, however, not only defeat and imprisonment at the hands of the Tartars but also the cruelty of a usurper who had him blinded. Luckily, however, the usurper's support was weak, and with aid from Tver Basil was restored. In 1452 he founded the Tartar principality of Kasimov under a friendly Tartar prince on the upper Oka east of Kyazan as a buffer against the hostile Tartars of Kazan, but now that not only Kazan but also the Crimea had split off from the old khanate, the latter was no longer a political threat of any consequence, and Basil II thus became the first prince of Moscow to emancipate himself completely from Tartar vassalage. Almost at the moment that Moscow became free Constantinople fell before the Turks, and the prince of Moscow became at one stroke the chief defender of the Orthodox faith and residuary legatee of the Byzantine tradition. Basil II was also successful in strengthening Muscovite influence in Novgorod, which had hitherto been prone to intrigue with Lithuania.

The expansion of Muscovite prestige undertaken amid such great difficulties by Basil II gathered new impetus during the reign of his son, Ivan III, who inherited the principality of Moscow in 1462. After first checkmating the Tartars by diplomatic agreements with adjacent oriental states, he attached himself to the Byzantine dynastic tradition by choosing, as his second wife, Zoe (Sophia) Palaeologa who, though stout and unattractive, was the niece of the last emperor of Byzantium. The Pope hoped this marriage might advance the union of the Eastern and the Western Churches, since Zoe had been raised a Catholic as his ward, and when she went to Moscow to be married in 1472, a papal legate accompanied her. He made no progress in his attempts to initiate negotiations, and Zoe's arrival was far more fruitful through the activities of the Italian architects and artisans whom she brought with her and who were soon adorning the Kremlin with Italianate churches and palaces. Ivan's designs against the Tartar khanate in the south were crossed by the Turks, who in 1475 subjugated both the khanate and the Crimea, and remained in southern Russia

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

until the reign of Catherine II. At Novgorod, the pro-Lithuanian faction was still active despite the pledges exacted by Basil II. In 1475 Ivan personally visited the northern republic and three years thereafter the great commercial metropolis, long the only stronghold of democracy in Russia, was incorporated into the principality of Moscow. Thirteen years later the Tartar khanate of Kazan as a result of local dynastic rivalries also became a vassal, and an expedition in 1481 broke up the last vestiges of Tartar power on the Volga, where only Astrakhan remained in Tartar hands.

Ivan's reputation soon spread to western Europe, with the result that Emperor Maximilian I in 1488 sent an envoy to Moscow offering the prince a royal crown. Ivan was not unwilling to make a treaty with Maximilian covering mutual aid in case of a war with Poland, but remarked he did not need German confirmation of his royal status. On the Lithuanian side Ivan was equally fortunate since he forced the Lithuanians to abandon all claims on eastern Russian cities and to recognize him as "sovereign of all Russia" (*gosudar vseya Rusi*), while his daughter became the wife of the Prince of Lithuania. Under Ivan's son Basil III, who came to the throne in 1505, Pskov and Ryazan were added to the Muscovite domain, but relations with the Tartars both at Kazan and in the south were so far impaired that constant defensive measures were necessary on the southern frontier along the Oka.

When Basil died in 1533, his son Ivan IV (later known as the Terrible) was but three years old. The regency thus devolved till 1538 on the lad's mother, and from that date to 1547, when Ivan was crowned as tsar, upon a council of nobles in which factional politics were rife. It was from his experiences during this period that Ivan derived his intense hatred of the older feudal nobility as a class. Ivan finally conquered Kazan and annexed Astrakhan, thus placing the whole course of the Volga under Muscovite control. From that moment begins the Russian expansion into Siberia and the initiation of diplomatic relations with Khiva and Bokhara. At the same time the Eng-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

175* At the same time the Eng-
lish, through Chancellor's expedition to the White Sea in 1553,
721 opened up the northern sea route. Ivan was also conscious of
706 the economic advantages of owning a Baltic port and began
716 operations against the Livonian order of German knights which controlled both the Gulf of Riga and the Gulf of Finland. After capturing Narva, he founded the Russian navy a century and a quarter before Peter the Great by confiscating and arming a number of German merchant vessels, for which he employed German and Swedish officers as commanders. Ivan's early successes proved a boomerang, however, since the Livonian order was dissolved and Esthonia was turned over to Sweden. This event automatically produced a collision with that country, allied with Lithuania, so that war became incessant on the western front until Ivan's death in 1584.

175* By that date the formation and the future policy of modern Russia was clearly defined. It was a foregone conclusion that future Russian sovereigns would extend Russian territory to the Black Sea. It was only a question of time when the weakening of Poland and Lithuania would bring the Dnieper valley and White Russia under Muscovite sway. It had become a cardinal item of Russian policy to control the Finnish Gulf, and maritime commerce with the west would traverse those waters
[177] as soon as ports were either conquered or developed. The long period of Russian isolation from Europe was ended, and the difficult process of acquiring modern European techniques was about to begin. Russia had graduated from oriental domination and was on its way to becoming a major European power, never to approach the East again, save in the hope of conquest.

642 In view of the gradual evolution of Muscovite sovereignty,
632 it is important to understand also the origins of autocracy in Moscow itself. For autocracy was by no means inevitable or universal in medieval Russia, and in the principality of Kiev the early princes had always had to reckon with town assemblies which supervised and even frequently deposed them. The influence of these assemblies was large in any medieval Russian city of which the economic and political status had been deter-

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

just as much to the building up of Bohemia as did the Czechs. Apart from the early conflicts by which Bohemia became a German vassal, the colonists were brought into the country voluntarily by Bohemian princes and barons, and they could therefore hardly be regarded in our own time as an inferior element with restricted rights in an area to whose economic and cultural development they had been generously contributing for seven hundred years.

It is fair to observe, however, that internal conflict between Czech and German broke out at the time of the Hussite Wars of the fifteenth century. The radical Hussites bitterly attacked the German population, which was in the main composed of faithful Catholics, and even wiped out the entire German citizenry of numerous cities and towns, while such German residents who compounded with the Hussite extremists were subjected to a violent campaign of Czechization. The results of this epoch of conflict were catastrophic. Most of what the German element jointly with the Bohemian had built up in three centuries of faithful effort was destroyed in less than half a century during which the Czechs split with the Germans on account of their loyal Catholicism. The weakness of the Hussite movement was that, while doubtless promoting a healthy national spirit, it broke down the traditional contacts which in previous centuries had contributed appreciably to the advance of culture and to the international prestige of the nation. The succession to the Bohemian crown first passed to the house of Austria in 1437, and Bohemia subsequently remained under the sovereignty of the Hapsburgs uninterruptedly from 1526 to 1918. During this period of nearly three hundred years there was obviously little doubt of the dominance of German influence.

Before turning to early German relations with the rising Polish state, let us follow the fortunes of the Slavs who emigrated westward to the basin of the Elbe. While the burden of German colonization on the Danube front was carried by the Bavarians with some aid from the Franconians, the same

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

function was performed in north central Germany by the Saxons. The first thrust of Slavic westward pressure had been felt in the fifth century by the Thuringians, whom the Slavs drove westward into the Thuringian forest and the Harz Mountains. As soon as the Thuringians were subjected by the Franks, the age of Slavo-German conflict set in, and hostilities were intermittent in eastern Franconia during the seventh century. Then, in the eighth century, the establishment of numerous monastery-fortresses on the frontier between the Danube and the Weser heralded an aggressive German offensive which developed as soon as the Franks in 804 had conquered the great tribal duchy of Saxony in lower Germany between the Elbe and the Rhine. The German *Drang nach Osten* which resulted in the dispossession and practical extermination of the Slavs on north-German soil thus began in Charlemagne's day, and continued for nearly four hundred years. Charlemagne opened the contest in 789 by attacking the Wilzi, a federation of Slavic tribes residing east of the Elbe in the vicinity of modern Berlin, and their spirited resistance induced him to give his eastern frontier a solid military organization. New fortresses were built on the lower Elbe to protect Saxony from Slavic invasion. Under Louis the Pious, Hamburg and Würzburg became advance posts of German missionary activity, but the last half of the ninth century witnessed almost constant warfare along the Slavo-German frontier from Hamburg to Bohemia, and these border clashes were a fruitful source of slave labor for the vast properties of the new German monasteries of the eastern front.

In 919, with the election of Duke Henry of Saxony as King of the Germans and successor to Conrad I, the last of the Carolingians, the period of large-scale Saxon aggression against the north German Slavs began. The first Saxon conquest recovered the area between the Saale and the upper Elbe, roughly between modern Halle and Meissen. Then, in the winter of 928-929, Henry pushed across the Elbe and captured Branibor, the stronghold of the Slavs on the Havel west of

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

Berlin, transforming it into a fortress which is the ancestor of modern Brandenburg. A Slavic coalition inspired by this offensive was defeated in 929 near Wittenberg, and the Saxon sphere of influence was thus extended to the Oder river. While Henry I showed little interest in colonizing the area he had won, and was solely concerned with collecting tribute, a movement of colonization was first reflected by a large number of fortified German settlements established east of the lower Elbe under Henry's successor Otto I, and a similar practice prevailed further south in the reconquered territory between the Saale and the upper Elbe. The German treatment of their Slavic subjects was far from gentle: captives taken in war were ruthlessly butchered, and chieftains invited as guests were treacherously slain. As a result, a Slavic revolt of 983 threw the Saxons out of Brandenburg. For a hundred and fifty years the Slavic coastal area from Lübeck to the Oder was thus free of Saxon encroachment, and it was not until after 1125 that the linguistic frontier in this region advanced beyond where it had stood in Charlemagne's day.

With the election of Duke Lothar of Saxony as King of the Germans in 1125, the situation altered. Even before his accession to the throne, Lothar had been known to the Slavs as a dangerous adversary, and no such drastically anti-Slavic policy as his had been seen since Henry the Fowler two hundred years before. His collaboration with the Danes broke up the Slavic principalities on the Baltic shore east of Holstein, and after Lothar's death in 1137 the coastline between Kiel and Rostock was soon in German hands. Wholesale colonization by Westphalian and other Low-German settlers immediately ensued under reasonably peaceful conditions, which unfortunately were interrupted by a fanatical crusade against the Slavs in 1147, in the vicissitudes of which most of the newly won territory was cruelly devastated. The result was thirty years of conflict in which the last independent group of Baltic Slavs was obliterated. Meanwhile Brandenburg had come back under German control when its Slavic chief died intestate

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

in 1150 and willed his holdings to the neighboring German margrave. German influence was thus restored in this area to the Oder frontier which it had temporarily reached two hundred years before.

Albert von Ballenstedt, called "the Bear," Margrave of the Nordmark, into whose hands Brandenburg fell by legacy, is the most sympathetic figure of the German colonization period. He refused to participate in the Wendish crusade of 1147, and thus won the confidence of his Slavic subjects. Brandenburg was free from the trivial and exasperating obligations that weighed upon the peasantry of the older settled regions. There were no traditional rights and no antiquated feudal interests, with the result that as population increased in the west, pioneer colonization toward the east was intensified. The analogy is frequently drawn between this medieval German colonization of the eastern marches and the American migration west of the Alleghenies at the beginning of the nineteenth century. As one French historian wrote in 1875, "the German emigrant in the Middle Ages went beyond the Elbe in order to find free land as today he is crossing the Atlantic." Albert himself died in 1170, but well into the thirteenth century, under his successors, this colonization moved on toward the Polish borderland, and Frankfurt on the Oder was founded in 1253.

As a matter of fact, German contacts with Poland date back to the latter part of the reign of Otto I, who occupied the German throne from 936 to 973. Under Otto I the German margrave subjugated the Slavs of Lusatia, and extended his sway into Lower Silesia as far as the Bober river, but when one of his successors somewhat later endeavored to extend German influence east of the Oder into Polish territory, he was thrown back in 979. As it was mentioned in dealing with the conversions of the various Slavic nations, Prince Mieszko I of Poland had abandoned paganism in 966 upon his marriage to Dubravka, sister of the Bohemian prince Boleslav I, and three years later founded the bishopric of Posen, which

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

The monasteries were, on the whole, the only large private landowners, and supplied an example by their organization of large manors worked by half-free peasants.

With the throne weakened by the pretensions of the Polish nobility, an aggressive foreign policy was unthinkable. After Vladislav Hermann accepted the status of a German vassal in 1080, no Polish prince dared assume the title of king for two centuries. The Elbe valley and Silesia were definitely lost, together with the Pomeranian seaboard west of the Vistula. Then, early in the thirteenth century, when the still pagan Prussians menaced Duke Conrad of Mazovia (along the Vistula northwest of Warsaw) he turned for aid to the knights of the Teutonic Order, who entered Mazovia and occupied the districts ceded to them in 1229. They immediately founded strong points at Thorn, Kulm, Elbing and elsewhere, and by placing themselves under papal protection obviated any chance of Polish sovereignty. The next fifty years were occupied by the struggle of the Teutonic Order, supported by the margraves of Brandenburg and Meissen, against the Prussians. Königsberg was founded in 1255, when the Slavic Duke of Pomerelia, on the lower Vistula north of Thorn, became a vassal of the Margrave of Brandenburg, and Danzig fell into German hands for the first time. The Brandenburgers, however, were unable to hold it, and it was not until 1343 that Polish claims to the so-called Pomorze were given up.

Apart from domestic disorders, Poland was also shaken during this period by a disastrous invasion of the Tartars, who in 1241 burned Cracow, invaded Silesia, and sacked Breslau. The depopulation caused both by civil war and this invasion impoverished the Polish princes and induced them to encourage German immigration. The movement had started even before the onslaught of the Tartars, for German villages began to appear in Silesia as early as 1140. But after the Tartar incursion, German settlements spread to every part of Poland. The belt laid waste by the Tartars had been thickly settled since the principal commercial highways between the west and the

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

Levant passed through Breslau and Cracow. The German settlers therefore followed the line of least resistance and were spared the usual hard pioneer work because the soil they occupied had already been under cultivation for long periods. The colonists received exemption from taxes over a certain fixed term, and could build their towns as they desired, living under their native customs and enjoying absolute home rule.

By the middle of the fourteenth century there were some 150 German village settlements in the modern province of Posen alone, and at the same time cities destroyed by the Tartars were resettled by German colonists, who also founded new towns in Polish territory. Among the rebuilt cities largely populated by Germans in the fourteenth century we may note Sandomierz, Cracow, and Breslau, and among major German settlements at previous Polish centers, Gnesen, Posen, Kalish, Lublin, and even Warsaw itself. As late as 1480, three quarters of the burghers of Warsaw had German names. By the metropolitan cities of Germany these settlements were rightly regarded as outposts of German trade and civilization. The proportion of German population in Poland at the middle of the fourteenth century is estimated at 25 per cent, though many of the German colonists were polonized by the sixteenth. The wave of German settlement extended even beyond Cracow into Eastern Galicia toward Przemysl and Lemberg (Lvóv). Until 1470, indeed, no one but Germans sat on the Lemberg city council.

Simultaneously with the conflict between the Teutonic Order and the Prussians, German conquest and colonization pursued its way up the Baltic seaboard toward the Gulf of Finland. Settlers from Lübeck established themselves for trading purposes at the mouth of the Dvina as early as 1150, but the conquest of Livonia did not begin until the year 1200. Riga was founded as a city and as a missionary bishopric in 1201. The militant Order of the Sword Bearers was then organized to combat the Finnish tribes of the seacoast and the Letts of the interior. They were subject to the Bishop of Riga, and

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

were granted one-third of the land they thus captured. In 1236, however, after a defeat by the Lithuanians, the Sword Bearers combined with the Teutonic Order, and their joint ambitions would have made them masters of the north Russian city-states of Pskov and Novgorod if they had not been defeated by Prince Alexander Nevski on the ice of Lake Peipus in the winter of 1242.

We have dwelt in some detail on these developments to show how remote are all the origins of the political quarrels which have been resumed before our own eyes during the course of the second World War. Yet this extraordinary process was not without its halts and interruptions. Poland recovered much of its driving power under the administration of Kazimir the Great from 1333 to 1370. Meanwhile, the pressure of the Teutonic Order had contributed to unifying Lithuanian resistance, and a strong Lithuania had now developed with a culture predominantly Russian. By 1363, indeed, as we have seen, the Lithuanians had captured Kiev and were advancing toward the Black Sea. The union of Poland and Lithuania, consecrated by the marriage of the Lithuanian Prince Jagailo with Queen Yadwiga of Poland in 1386, was a severe blow to the Teutonic Order, since the conversion of the Lithuanians to Christianity largely deprived the Order of its missionary pretext for existence. The Polish victory at Grünwald-Tannenberg on July 15, 1410 broke its power, and after some further military exchanges a peace of 1422 limited German holdings in East Prussia to frontiers which lasted generally until the Treaty of Versailles.

The activities of the Order in the eastern Baltic continued until the sixteenth century. In Livonia and Esthonia there had been no colonization by German peasants, and the country was thus held only by the nobility, the church, and the citizens. The Muscovite thrust toward the Baltic affected not only the city-states of Pskov and Novgorod, but also the coastal possessions of the Order. The knights successfully resisted Ivan III, but Ivan the Terrible, as we know, took up the task which his

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

grandfather had begun, and as a result of his victories in 1559 the Order was dissolved. Esthonia became Swedish, Livonia fell into Polish hands, and Courland became a hereditary duchy and a fief of the kingdom of Poland. Esthonia and Livonia did not definitely become Russian until the Peace of Nystadt in 1721, and Courland fell into Russian possession only by the third partition of Poland in 1795. Early in the second World War we witnessed the final German surrender of all vested rights in this area acquired since the beginning of the thirteenth century.

Though Poland of the sixteenth century was by no means a peaceful state, it felt the influence of the Protestant reformation and, at least until a Catholic reaction set in under Jesuit direction about 1564 after the Council of Trent, had a reputation for religious tolerance. As a result, the religious wars in Germany started a new current of emigration into Polish territory, especially into the Posen area. At the same time, Low-German Protestants (Mennonites and other reformists) moved into the Pomorze around Danzig, where the local population had been decimated by the thirteen-years' war waged by Kazimir Jagiellonczyk against the weakened Teutonic Order from 1453 to 1466. This Low-German immigration took on greater proportions after Stephen Batory's siege and capture of Danzig in 1577, extending particularly to the courses of the Warthe and Netze rivers. Though the counter-reformation was by this time in full swing throughout Poland, these Protestant settlers, because of their industry and skill in agriculture, were guaranteed religious freedom, and remained free peasants even in an age when serfdom was the native Polish farmer's universal lot. At the same time, however, other settlers came into the lower Vistula valley from Brandenburg and Pomerania under much more onerous conditions, since they were without capital and completely subject to the caprice of their landlords.

This migratory movement was resumed in the seventeenth century during the Thirty Years' War, though many of the refugees from Brandenburg returned from Poland to their

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

be sought in the most remote centuries, in the contact of the Slavs with the Turanian peoples of the Steppes, who were the foundation of the so-called 'Scythic' Iranian population. From time immemorial, the Turko-tartar peoples, by their pillaging raids, have borne heavily on the Iranians, their immediate neighbours, and, through them, on the Slavonic peoples. The Iranians have been the victims of the Turkomans of the salt Steppes—and the Slavs, by repercussion, have shared their fate. Having thus exhausted their political and social strength, they have become the chronic prey of the conquerors.

This thesis of an original curse, whatever its scientific value, should be borne in mind, for it justifies a conviction that is widespread among the Germans, *viz.*, the inferiority of the Slavonic race, and its presumed incapacity to develop from the notion of a clan to that of a State. There have been published anthologies of German thinkers and propagandists on this theme, which is summed up in the well-known witticism *Gute Nacht, Russen, nach Asien!*—which the Germans have invoked, even down to our own times, to justify considering Eastern Europe merely as a contemptible suburb of Teutonism.

Such is the background of history on which was projected the 'reckoning' on which Bethmann-Hollweg and von Moltke had banked. Must we, however, go so far as to say that the War of 1914 was a Teuto-Slavonic war? M. Benes considers this thesis as attractive as it is untenable. He regards this war as a struggle between two political and philosophical conceptions, the logical development of the European evolution which, beginning at the Renaissance, culminated in the triumph of political individualism, of parliamentary and constitutional law. The war, he says, was not Teuto-Slavonic in character, nor in aims, nor in results.

Limited to the strict sequence of facts, this judgement is admissible. While Austria-Hungary threw herself into the war to prevent a rupture of her interior balance to the advantage of the Slavs, deeper and more decisive causes armed the Great Powers one against the other.

If, however, we consider the atmosphere that reigned in Europe in 1914, when the war found so many inflammable substances in a state of suspense, M. Benes's point of view seems more contestable. The interests of the Slavs were neither

6; Mounet H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* coherent nor systematised; no one was pursuing a policy of
• 721 defending or destroying them as a whole. But the Slavonic world had let loose outbursts of passion which, for some years, had been fanning all the centres of trouble into flame. These had greatly helped to create the psychological atmosphere which had rendered the clash inevitable. So we may say that, if Slavism as such had indeed nothing to do with the development of the drama, it had at least written the prologue to it.

* * *

186* Such being the case, it is scarcely necessary to remind the
668 reader that, during the 1914–1918 War, the Slavs had no general
648 political policy. They evolved within the framework of their historical antecedents, as long as the conflict offered no other prospect than that of a German victory. On several occasions Russian officialdom even adopted an anti-Slav position. They agreed to the cession of Dalmatia to Italy, opposed the union of the Slovenes and the Croats with the Serbians, resisted the concessions which Russia's allies asked her to grant to Poland, and showed obvious lack of goodwill at the Czech suggestions for the creation of an independent army.

The Czechoslovaks had a more coherent policy, and gave ample proof of loyalism. From the very beginning of the operations, whole units deserted under fire and went over to the Russians. They have been reproached with having first declared themselves in favour of the autonomy of Poland within the framework of Russia, rather than of her full independence. At the time when they adopted it, that attitude was a realistic, rather than a sentimental one.

The Poles were, above all, anti-German; for a long time they humoured Austria-Hungary, and several of them served her brilliantly. It must not be forgotten that the Dual Monarchy's anti-Slav policy was often the work of Slavs: Coluchowski (Minister of Foreign Affairs), Bilinski (Joint Minister of Bosnia-Herzegovina), Dumba (ambassador), Tarnowski, etc. In any case, a Slavonic policy would have meant a mortal struggle with Vienna and Budapest; the Poles could not resign themselves to that. Besides, would the Russians have given them sufficient understanding, if not support, to make up for the goodwill they could rely on finding among the Magyars and the Austrians?

6; Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

declared war on Tsarist Russia, but refused to do so in 1940 on Soviet Russia, although she owed much to the former and nothing to the latter. Even then, in 1915, she was obliged to intern a good many politicians and generals before embarking on her campaign, a campaign which, in actual fact, both sides conducted in 'slow motion'. The Russian Black Sea Fleet fired fifty-nine shells on Varna; in the Dobrudja, the Bulgarians were opposed to the Rumanians and to the Serbian Corps, while the Germans were engaged with the Russians of Chtcherbatchev. This realist nation, little given to passionate or ideological enthusiasms, nevertheless showed a curious obstinacy in 'backing the wrong horse'. In 1913, 1915, and 1942, they entered the war with the winners, and came out of it with the vanquished. The 'Macedonian psychosis' periodically pushed them into the arms of 'liberators', only to end by sharing their defeat.

After the Treaty of Neuilly, the Bulgarian propagandists realised the error made by their leaders. They returned to the theme of Slavonic affinities, to the pro-Russian tradition. 'We Bulgarians', said the *Narodna Otbrana*,[13] 'have been the pioneers of a foreigners' policy, and have pulled the chestnuts out of the fire for others'. 'The future of Bulgaria is closely bound up with that of Russia', proclaimed the Minister, Bakalov.[14] And Stamboliiski entered into a mortal struggle with the Macedonian organisation, to clear the way for an entente with Belgrade. He succumbed in this struggle; his successors realised, after much shilly-shallying, that this policy was a reasonable one, but could not be imposed until the psychological atmosphere it had always lacked had been prepared for it.

And yet, paradoxical as it may seem, in the thick of the fratricidal struggles in which she has engaged, Bulgaria has never stifled her inner feeling of community of destiny with Serbia. When the Bulgarian resistance collapsed in 1918, a Deputy-Prefect of the occupying authorities took leave of the inhabitants of his administrative district in these terms: 'We shall perhaps

[13] Of June 30, 1920.

[14] The Bulgarian Church, like the Serbian-Orthodox Church, refused to make the religious calendar coincide with the civil calendar when the State adopted the Gregorian reckoning. The two Churches gave, as the reason for this refusal, the fact that it was impossible to come to an agreement with the Russian Church, which then had no competent representative.

61 Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

Chapter Four

THE SECOND WORLD WAR AND THE SLAV LIBERATION FRONT

THE historians of the future will be struck by one fact which seems to escape those of our own day, and which we consider below.

Whereas the wars of the nineteenth century originated in, or had as pretexts, disputes localised in different parts of the globe—Spanish Succession (1823 and 1870), the affair of the Duchies, Italian unity, German unity, the protection of the Holy Places, etc.—the thunder-clouds which foreshadowed the wars of the twentieth century all burst in a Slavonic sky.

The annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1908 created the atmosphere which favoured the germination of the Italo-Turkish War and of the Balkan Wars. The Sarajevo outrage in June, 1914, was the pretext for the First World War. The Sudeten-land crisis in 1938, which led to the Runciman mission, was the prologue to the Munich bargaining. The whole of the pre-liminary phase of the Second World War was enacted on Slav territory.

Contrary to all international engagements, the Munich Conference on September 29, 1938, sanctioned the mutilation of Czechoslovakia, in whose history this Conference will remain as a 'second White Hill'.

Then occurred various 'Slavonic episodes', as preludes to the general conflagration. Poland occupied Teschen on October 2, 1938. A few days later Slovakia proclaimed her autonomy. On November 2, the Ribbentrop-Ciano arbitration award, pronounced in Vienna, transferred the eastern part of Czecho-slovakia (Sub-Carpathia) to Magyar rule.

On March 15, 1939, 'President' Hacha handed over to the Führer the fate of Bohemia; Hitler entered Prague—Czecho-slovakia was wiped off the map.

On August 23, 1939, Germany and the Soviet Union signed a ten-year pact of non-aggression. Reassured on the Russian side, Germany turned against Poland. Incidents were multiplied

6t Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

721 648 175 in Danzig; German criminals, dressed in Polish uniforms, attacked German villages in Upper Silesia to provide Hitler with the pretext for an invasion. This was launched on September 1, at 5.45 a.m. The curtain was raised for the greatest drama in history.

186* 578 648 But, beyond this, the historian who, with these facts as his starting-point, sought to establish synchronism between the feeling of a common destiny among the Slavs and the great wars of the twentieth century would very soon conclude that no such feeling existed. At all times of threatened crisis, there have appeared more or less general impulses towards *rapprochement*; the first result of all actual crises has been to set the Slavs one against the other. In this Second World War, as in that of 1914–1918, we were again to find the Bulgars, the Croats, and the Slovaks ranged with Germany, Bohemia trampled upon, Poland quartered, Serbia crucified, Russia at grips with the Teutonic colossus.

Much more: the Slavs participated in the spoils. Poland rewarded herself at Czechoslovakia's expense, Russia at Poland's, and Bulgaria at Serbia's.

175 648 721 Just as the 1914–1918 war had started with the crushing of Serbia, so that of 1939 had as its prologue the carving-up of Czechoslovakia. The latter succumbed to the fate which had forced her to look for support to the Western Democracies, with whom she had no territorial connection, and whose diplomacy, wavering or swept along by the back-wash of internal policy, had been able neither to ensure peace nor to provide for war. The inconsequentiality of France, signing a pact with Moscow, then hastening to evade its consequences, encouraging Yugoslavia to be on her guard against Fascist megalomania, then signing the Four-Power Pact and observing it no more than she had done the previous pacts; all this culminated in the Munich Pact, which—whether justified or not by our military unpreparedness—completed the state of confusion among the nations for whom France was the greatest asset in peace as in war.

It was not only by its inaugural phase—the dismembering of Czechoslovakia and the aggression against Poland—that the war once again seemed destined to become a reckoning between Slavs and Teutons. In *Mein Kampf* Hitler had reproached

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

William II for never having acquired new lands in the east. It was not, at that time, a question of fighting Communism, but of 'living space'—a theory which, in Nazi ideology, was directed at the States bordering Eastern Germany and, beyond them, the 'fabulous resources' (*unerhörte Möglichkeiten*) of the Ukraine. Once more the Teuton resumed his age-long vocation of 'consumer of Slavs'.

But, looking closer into the matter, this was not, any more than in 1914, the essential cause of the Pan-Germanic explosion. Hitler's Germany was aiming higher, and farther. Actuated by what she considered to be a prime necessity of her geographical situation and of her 'racial pre-eminence', she regarded herself as the providential elaborator of new syntheses calculated to regenerate the world—but which were, in reality, simply the oldest of hegemonic appetites. It was not upon the Slavs that she declared war; it was upon a form of civilisation made up of Humanism and Christianity which the centuries had identified with the habitable world. The Slavs were the first victims of the *Wehrmacht*, simply because they were considered to be the easiest obstacle to overcome, owing to the inferiority complex which, from time immemorial, the German school had attributed to them. Their geographical position condemned them to be the target for the first onslaught. But the Slavonic world was subjected to unprecedented trials in all the different phases of the war—Czech, Polish, Balkan, Russian. Therein lay the real, the only 'Slavonic' aspect of this war—the recurrence of the periodic catastrophe which crushes these nations as soon as Europe is unleashed against herself.

So March 15, 1939—the date of the occupation of Prague by Hitler's troops—aroused deep emotion among the Southern Slavs, who realised that the dyke which had hitherto held back the German drive on Eastern Europe had collapsed. There were manifestations of sympathy in Belgrade and in Sofia, especially among the students; messages flowed into Prague from all the Slavonic regions in the Balkans.

Germany herself seems to have had some obscure realisation of her crime. A curious article in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* of April 23, 1939—an article whose author foresaw the opprobrium that this 'operation' was to cast upon his country—endeavoured to reconcile the policy of the 'Protectorate' of Bohemia with the